arXiv:hep-th/9912020v4 21 Jun 2000

Wilson Loop and the Treatment of Axial Gauge Poles

Satish. D. Joglekar[*]
Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology
Kanpur 208 016, UP, India
A. Misra [†]
Institute of Physics, Sachivalaya Marg
Bhubaneswar 751 005, Orissa, India

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We consider the question of gauge invariance of the Wilson loop in the light of a new treatment of axial gauge propagator proposed recently based on a finite field-dependent BRS (FFBRS) transformation. We remark that as under the FFBRS transformation the vacuum expectation value of a gauge invariant observable remains unchanged, our prescription automatically satisfies the Wilson loop criterion. Further, we give an argument for *direct* verification of the invariance of Wilson loop to O(g^4) using the earlier work by Cheng and Tsai. We also note that our prescription preserves the thermal Wilson loop to O(g^2).

The axial-type gauges have found favor in many Standard Model calculations on account of their formal ghost-free nature. Associated, however, with the axial gauges, are the problems posed by the spurious $1/(\eta \cdot q)^p$-type

---

[*] e-mail:sdj@iitk.ac.in
[†] e-mail:aalok@iitk.ac.in

singularities. Much literature has been devoted to the question of how these these singularities can be interpreted [1]. There are a number of prescriptions for these singularities, some of which are the principle-value prescription (PVP) [2], Leibbrandt-Mandelstam (LM)[3], the α-prescription [4], the van Niewenhuizen-Landshoff prescription [5] (for a subset of axial gauges), etc. PVP and LM are associated with extensive literature and some of their limitations have been established [6]. Many of the prescriptions have been of an ad-hoc nature and as a result require validation in the form of various checks such as validity of WT identities [1], preservation of Wilson loop [7] and the thermal Wilson loop [8], etc. It has, for example, been shown that the PVP does not preserve the Wilson loop to O(g^4)[9]. The same holds for the thermal Wilson loop and the α-prescription [10].

Recently, we have proposed [11, 12], a direct way to handle the $1/(\eta\cdot q)^p$-type singularities based on a "finite field-dependent BRS (FFBRS) transformation"[13, 14]. This method is based directly on correlating the generating functionals themselves [15] in the two set of gauges via FFBRS transformation. Such a set of transformations automatically preserves the vacuum expectation value of gauge-invariant observables to all orders. To be concrete, consider the effective actions (in obvious notations)

$$\begin{aligned} S^L_{\text{eff}}[A,c,\bar{c},\epsilon] &= S^0[A] - \int d^4x \Big(\frac{1}{2\lambda}(\partial\cdot A^\alpha)^2 + \bar{c}^\alpha M^{\alpha\beta} c^\beta + i\epsilon[\frac{1}{2}(A^\alpha)^2 - \bar{c}c] \Big) \\ &\equiv S^L_{\text{eff}} + \epsilon O_1[A,c,\bar{c}], \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where the ϵ-terms in S_{eff} have been put in accordance with the replacement $q^2 \to q^2 + i\epsilon$ for all poles in the Lorentz-type gauges [16]. As implied in [12, 15], the correct treatment of axial-type gauges is obtained via an effective action (in obvious notations)

$$S^A_{eff}[A',c',\bar{c}',\epsilon] = S^0[A'] - \int d^4x \Big(\frac{1}{2\lambda}(\eta\cdot A'^\alpha)^2 + \bar{c}'^\alpha \tilde{M}^{\alpha\beta} c'^\beta \Big) + \epsilon O'_1[A',c',\bar{c}'] \tag{2}$$

where the $O(\epsilon)$ terms in S^A_{eff} are obtained by performing a field transformation $[A,c,\bar{c}] \to [A',c',\bar{c}']$ which is an FFBRS transformation [12, 13] such that it preserves the vacuum-to-vacuum amplitude:

$$\int \mathcal{D}A\mathcal{D}c\mathcal{D}\bar{c}\, e^{iS^L_{\text{eff}}[A,c,\bar{c}]} = \int \mathcal{D}A'\mathcal{D}c'\mathcal{D}\bar{c}'\, e^{iS^A_{\text{eff}}[A',c',\bar{c}']}. \tag{3}$$

Such field transformations were constructed in a general context in [13]. As remarked in [11, 15], these transformations also preserve the vacuum expectation values of gauges-invariant observables:

$$\int \mathcal{D}A\mathcal{D}c\mathcal{D}\bar{c}O^{GI}[A]e^{iS^L_{\text{eff}}[A,c,\bar{c}]} = \int \mathcal{D}A'\mathcal{D}c'\mathcal{D}\bar{c}'O^{GI}[A']e^{iS^A_{\text{eff}}[A',c',\bar{c}']}. \tag{4}$$

Such a procedure was indeed adopted for the purpose of interpretation of $\frac{1}{(\eta \cdot q)^p}$-type singularities in axial-type gauges [11, 12].

In view of the fact that the Wilson loop

$$W[L] = \langle \text{Tr} PTe^{-ig\oint A^\mu dx_u} \rangle \tag{5}$$

is a gauge-invariant observable, it follows from (4) that our treatment is such that by its very construction, the Wilson loop $W[L]$ has the same value in the Lorentz and axial-type gauges to *all* orders.

While (4) provides a formal proof of the equivalence of $W[L]$ for the two sets of gauges, we shall also provided a reasonably brief proof of this statement to $\text{O}(g^4)$. We utilize the work of Cheng and Tsai [7] in order to shorten the argument.

We note that our propagator of [11, 12] is in fact of the general form used by Cheng and Tsai [7]:

$$\tilde{D}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{-i}{k^2 + i\epsilon'}(g_{\mu\nu} - a_\mu k_\nu - b_\nu k_\mu), \tag{6}$$

where $a_\mu(k) = -b_\mu(-k)$ by Bose symmetry. Cheng and Tsai [7] prove the equivalence of Wilson loops in two gauges by introducing an effective ghost-ghost-gluon vertex:

$$G^\mu(k) = i\frac{[(a \cdot k) - 1]k^\mu - k^2 a^\mu(k)]}{k^2 + i\epsilon'} \tag{7}$$

(which includes propagator of outgoing ghost). As such the entire proof of equivalence of the Wilson loops in the Lorentz and axial-type gauges would go through, were it not for the fact that in our treatment the ghost as well as gluon propagator arise rather out of the effective action $S^A_{\text{eff}}[A', c', \bar{c}']$. Consequently, the results of [7] would imply the equivalence of Wilson loop in the two sets of gauges (axial and Lorentz) to $\text{O}(g^4)$ verified there if we could show that the two treatments of ghosts do not make any difference to this order.

For the sake of brevity, we refer the reader to the diagrams (Fig. 1) in [7]. We shall prove the desired result simply by showing that the (only) one diagram required to be considered in this calculation in fact vanishes for all loops for $\eta^2 < 0$ and in fact vanishes for a large class of loops for $\eta^2 > 0$.

The only diagram to $\mathrm{O}(g^4)$ that is relevant is the diagram 1(b) of [7] which is a diagram with two ends of a gluon propagator with a ghost-loop self-energy insertion. The entire propagator diagram (with the two gluon propagators) has the structure:

$$G_{\mu\nu}(p,\eta) = Ap_\mu p_\nu + Bp_\mu \eta_\nu + Cp_\nu \eta_\mu + D\eta_\mu \eta_\nu \tag{8}$$

where A, B, C and D are functions of $p^2, \eta \cdot p$ (and also depend on η^2). The whole contribution of this diagram to the Wilson loop is then of the form:

$$W^{[1]} \equiv \int d^4p \oint dx^\mu \oint dy^\nu e^{ip\cdot(x-y)} G_{\mu\nu}(p,\eta). \tag{9}$$

We shall now give a simple argument that for all loops the first three terms in (8) do not contribute to (9). We note that the contribution of the first two terms to (9) is of the form

$$W^{[1]} = \int d^4p \oint dx^\mu \oint dy^\nu e^{ip\cdot(x-y)} p_\mu \tilde{A}_\nu(p^2, \eta\cdot p) \tag{10}$$

which could be re-expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} W^{[1]} &= \int d^4p \tilde{A}_\nu(p^2,\eta\cdot p) \oint dy^\nu e^{-ip\cdot y} \oint dx^\mu p_\mu e^{ip\cdot x} \\ &= \int d^4p \tilde{A}(p^2,\eta\cdot p) \oint dy^\nu e^{-ip\cdot y} \oint dx^\mu (-i\partial_\mu) e^{ip\cdot x}. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Now, for a fixed p and y, we can evaluate

$$\oint dx^\mu \partial_\mu (e^{ip\cdot x}) \tag{12}$$

from 'y' to 'y' along the loop and find that it vanishes. A similar argument applies to the third term: Here we evaluate $\oint dy^\nu p_\nu e^{-ip\cdot y}$ first.

We now consider the contribution of the last term. It reads

$$W^{[1,4]} \equiv \int d^4p \oint_L dx^\mu \eta_\mu e^{ip\cdot x} \oint_L dy^\nu \eta_\nu e^{-ip\cdot y} D(p^2, \eta\cdot p, \eta^2). \tag{13}$$

The Wilson loop is a gauge-invariant quantity. We expect that $W[L]$ is independent of the orientation of η. This is because an infinitesimal change in η obtained through a Lorentz transformation, is in fact an infinitesimal change in the gauge fixing term (and the associated change in the ghost term). Under such a change, the use of BRS WT identities will imply invariance of $W[L]$, the expectation vale of a gauge invariant operator[17]. Therefore, in evaluating $W[L]$, we can choose to perform a suitable Lorentz transformation, $\eta^\mu \to \eta'^\mu = \Lambda^\mu_\nu \eta^\nu$ on η^μ. Then (13) becomes:

$$W^{[1,4]} = \int d^4p \oint_L dx^\mu \eta'_\mu e^{ip\cdot x} \oint_L dy^\nu \eta'_\nu e^{-ip\cdot y} D(p^2, \eta'\cdot p, \eta^2). \tag{14}$$

Now, (14) would vanish for a planar loop if we could choose $\eta'^\mu = \Lambda^\mu_\nu \eta^\nu$ such that it is perpendicular to the loop L ($\eta'^\mu dx_\mu = 0$). We now investigate when this is possible for a planar loop L. The plane of the loop is described (not necessarily uniquely) by the intersection of

$$a^\mu x_\mu = A \text{ and } b^\mu x_\mu = B. \tag{15}$$

(i) Let $\eta^2 < 0$. We note that at least one of a^μ, b^μ and $c^\mu \equiv (a^\mu - \frac{a^0}{b^0} b^\mu)$ (with $b^0 \neq 0$) is necessarily spacelike. We pick a space-like vector of these three and call it n^μ. Then for $\eta^2 < 0$, we can always choose η' parallel to n. Evidently, since $d(n\cdot x) = 0$, we have $\eta'^\mu dx_\mu = 0$ on L and (14) vanishes.

(ii) Let $\eta^2 > 0$. Suppose it is possible to construct a time-like vector out of linear combinations of a and b. Then, we call this 'n' and orient η' parallel to n. The argument proceeds as above. Evidently, the argument in this case, does not hold for those planar loops for which time-like normal does not exist.

(iii) Let $\eta^2 = 0$. If $(a\cdot b)^2 > a^2 b^2$, a real η exists such that $a + \beta b$ is light-like. In such case, we choose $n = a + \beta b$ and the argument proceeds as before.

The above argument in fact applies to loops more general than a planar loop. For example, for $\eta^2 < 0$, the argument applies to any loop confined to a 3-Dimensional subspace normal to some space-like vector.

The argument easily extends itself to any arbitrary loop for $\eta^2 < 0$ and to a subclass of arbitrary loops for $\eta^2 \geq 0$. We close the loop by a surface S which we cover by a patchwork of N planar loops (We might require the limit $N \to \infty$ for a given loop). We can then write

$$W[L] = \langle \mathrm{Tr} T P \mathrm{exp}\Big(\oint_L A_\mu dx^\mu\Big)\rangle = \langle \mathrm{tr} T P \mathrm{exp}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{N}\oint_{C_i} A_\mu dx^\mu\Big)\rangle. \tag{16}$$

The relevant $\mathrm{O}(g^4)$ contribution to $W[L]$ from ghost diagrams comes from the quadratic terms in the expansion of the exponent, for which the path ordering is immaterial since $\mathrm{tr}(T^a T^b) = \mathrm{tr}(T^b t^a)$. Such a typical term (apart from an overall coefficient) reads

$$\oint_{C_i} dx^\mu \oint_{C_j} dy^\nu G_{\mu\nu}(x,y). \tag{17}$$

We can now apply the arguments following equation (8) to the above typical term. While doing so, we shall come across contribution analogous to (14). In such a term, we need to choose η' perpendicular to *one* of the two loops C_i and C_j. Then the entire argument goes through for each such term (i,j) separately, provided η' can always be chosen normal to one of the loops[1]. As shown earlier, this is always possible for $\eta^2 < 0$. For $\eta^2 \geq 0$, this will hold only for a subclass of loops.

We also note that the $\mathrm{O}(g^2)$ thermal Wilson loop considered in [8] is given by:

$$W_R = 1 + \frac{(N_c^2-1)g^2}{2N_c T}\int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3}[1 - cos(\vec{k}\cdot\vec{R})]D_{00}(k^0=0,\vec{k}) \tag{18}$$

and thus depends only on $D_{00}(k^0 = 0, \vec{k})$. We find that for the propagator in [11, 12], $D_{00}(k^0 = 0, \vec{k}) = \frac{g_{00}}{k^2+i\epsilon}$ which is the same as $D_{00}(k^0 = 0, \vec{k})$ for Lorentz gauges and as such W_R has the same value as in Lorentz-type gauges.

To summarize, we have emphasized that the treatment we have given for axial gauge poles [11, 12] is by its very construction, compatible with the preservation of the Wilson loop to all orders. We have further given the proof of this statement to $O(g^4)$ using the earlier work by Cheng and Tsai. Our proof holds for any arbitrary loop for $\eta^2 < 0$ and for a subclass of loops for $\eta^2 \geq 0$. We have also noted the preservation of the thermal Wilson loop to $O(g^2)$ for our treatment.

---

[1] The above argument in fact assumes that our argument applies separately to each such term (i,j). This can be seen as follows: Let an arbitrary closed loop L be broken up as a sum of two arbitrary closed loops L_1 and L_2. Then $W[L]$ can be broken up as $W[L] = W[L_1] + W[L_2] + W[L_1, L_2]$. Here, $W[L_1, L_2]$ depends on both the loops. Now the entire argument of Cheng and Tsai and the argument we gave for the independence of direction of η applies to each of $W[L], W[L_1]$ and $W[L_2]$ and therefore to $W[L_1, L_2]$. This argument can easily be extended to the case when L is broken up in to N loops. Hence etc.

Acknowledgement

The authors thank Dr.M.Lavelle for a communication.

References

[1] See for example references in G. Leibbrandt, Rev Mod Phys **59**, 1067 (1987); G. Leibbrandt, *Noncovariant Gauges*, World Scientific (Singapore) 1994. A.Bassetto, G.Nardelli and R.Soldatti, *Yang Mills Theories in Algebraic Non-Covariant Gauges*, World Scientific (Singapore) 1991.

[2] W. Kummer, Nucl Phys. B **100**, 106 (1976).

[3] Leibbrandt G, Phys Rev D **29**, 1699 (1984),
Mandelstam S, Nucl Phys B **213**, 149 (1983).

[4] P.V.Landshoff Phys.Lett.B 169,69 (1986).

[5] P.V. Landshoff and P. von Niewenhuizen, Phys. Rev. D **50** 4157 (1994).

[6] See e.g.ref.1.

[7] H.Cheng and Tsai,Phys.Rev.D36,3196(1987).

[8] S.Nadkarni Phys. Rev. D33,3738(1986).

[9] S.Caracciolo,G.Curci,P.Minotti Phys.Lett.B113,311(1982).

[10] M.Lavelle and D.McMullan Z.Phys. C 59,351(1993).

[11] Satish D. Joglekar and A. Misra, hep-th/9812101,to appear in Jour.Math.Phys.(2000).

[12] Satish D. Joglekar and A. Misra, Mod. Phys. Lett A **14**, No. 30, 2083 (1999).

[13] S.D.Joglekar and B.P.Mandal, Phys Rev D **51**, 1919 (1995).

[14] R.S.Bandhu and S.D.Joglekar J.Phys.A-Math and General **31**, 4217 (1998); S.D.Joglekar in *Finite Field-dependent BRS (FFBRS) Transformations and Axial Gauges*; invited talk at the conference titled *Theoretical Physics Today: Trends and Perspectives* held at IAS Calcutta, April 1998; Ind. J. Phys. **73B**(2), 137 (1999).

[15] Satish D. Joglekar and A. Misra,hep-th/9909123, to appear in Int.J.Mod.Phys.A (1999).

[16] G.'t Hooft Nucl.Phys.B **33**, 173 (1971).

[17] *Qutantum Field Theory*, C.Itzykon, J-B.Zuber, McGraw Hill (1980).